DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 005 RC 012 312

TITLE The Bureau of Indian Affairs is Slow in Providing Special Education Services to All Handicapped Indian Children.
INSTITUTION Comptroller General of the U.S., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 4 Sep 79
NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *American Indian Education; American Indians; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Indian Relationship; Financial Support; Government Role; Handicap Identification; *Resource Allocation; *Special Education; Teacher Shortage
IDENTIFIERS *Bureau of Indian Affairs; Education for All Handicapped Children Act; Navajo Area Office Bureau of Indian Affairs AZ; Phoenix Area Office Bureau of Indian Affairs AZ

ABSTRACT

Many handicapped Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) schools are not receiving the benefits of special education services due to problems caused by poor leadership and a lack of emphasis on the program. Because of the late and incomplete evaluation of students, too few special education teachers have been hired, and funds that should have been used for that purpose have been spent for other purposes. The Senate and House Committees on Appropriations should restrict the Bureau's fiscal year 1980 special education funds to hiring special education teachers and specialists. In addition, the Secretary of the Interior should direct the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs to develop a plan to hire needed special education personnel as soon as possible and, further, to develop policies, guidelines, and realistic goals for the delivery of special education services to all handicapped children. The Navajo Area and Phoenix Area offices are used as examples throughout the report. (CM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

ED193005

B-114868

SEPTEMBER 4, 1979

OCT 1980
ERIC/CRESS
RECEIVED

The Honorable Robert C. Byrd
Chairman, Subcommittee on the
Department of Interior and
Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Subject: The Bureau of Indian Affairs is Slow in Providing Special Education Services to All Handicapped Indian Children (CED-79-121)

Your February 16, 1979, letter requested that we conduct a review to determine the progress the Bureau of Indian Affairs has made in its elementary and secondary schools to

--achieve the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 mandate of providing a free and appropriate public education to all handicapped children between the ages of 3 and 18 not later than September 1, 1978, and

--hire 202 special education teachers and specialists provided for by the Congress in appropriating an additional $5 million in fiscal year 1979.

Our review at the Navajo and Phoenix area offices showed that the Bureau made some progress toward achieving this mandate, but had not complied with the act's requirement to serve all handicapped children. We visited 19 schools with a tolal of 883 handicapped children. At these schools, teachers identified 340 students, or 38 percent, receiving full special education services, 113 students, or 13 percent, receiving partial services, and 430 students, or 49 percent, receiving no services.

The lack of progress resulted because the Bureau did not

--implement and administer an effective program at an early date,

RC 012312

(145860)

--identify and evaluate the handicapped children needing special education in a timely manner, and

--make sufficient efforts to recruit and hire needed special education personnel.

The Bureau did not take the initiative, after the act was passed in November 1975, to develop and administer a special education program in time to comply with the September 1, 1978, deadline. It was not until early in 1978 that the Bureau established an ad hoc division to manage a special education program. However, the division's effectiveness was limited because it was staffed with only four temporary program positions. The division also did not have direct authority over area offices and schools until an official division with an increased staffing level was created in March 1979, over 6 months after the compliance deadline. The Bureau's lack of timely emphasis and leadership adversely affected the development and progress of the program. Specific and comprehensive program guidelines were not developed and less than half of the identified handicapped students were actually receiving full special education services.

In passing the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, the Congress found that there were many handicapped children participating in regular school programs who were not having a successful educational experience because their handicaps were undetected. The act provided for identification and assessment of handicapping conditions in children. The identification of the number of handicapped students, their location, and their handicapping conditions are vital first steps in providing special education services. Until these steps are completed the number of teachers needed cannot be determined. However, the Navajo and Phoenix area offices did not start assessing students immediately. Student assessments were started in August 1977, in the Phoenix area, and in January 1978, in the Navajo area. Although at the time of our review the two area offices had completed assessments on most students suspected of being handicapped, they had not yet assessed all suspected children.

The Congress provided the Bureau with an additional $5 million of special education funds in fiscal year 1979 to hire an estimated 202 special education teachers and other specialists. Although these personnel are essential to providing special education services, the Navajo and Phoenix area offices have made insufficient

efforts to recruit and hire them. Consequently, many handicapped Indian children are not benefiting from special education services. The two area offices do have on board about 38 percent of the special education personnel that they have identified as needed. But their special education personnel needs may be greater than expected because some schools and agencies had not determined the number of personnel they need. In addition, the present staffing level is not a good indication of the effort put into hiring because most are not new hires but were converted from the title I program of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For example, 26 of the Navajo's 39 special education teachers and 6 of the 10 Phoenix special education positions were converted from the title I program.

In fiscal year 1978 the Bureau received $3.9 million for special education which was used primarily for student assessments. Funding was increased to $9.4 million in fiscal year 1979 primarily to allow the Bureau to hire an estimated 202 special education personnel. However, since the Bureau did not hire the necessary personnel, most of the funds were not spent and special education services have not been delivered as planned. The Navajo and Phoenix area offices received a special education allotment of about $5,092,000 in fiscal year 1979, but as of May 31, 1979, had only spent $797,000, or 16 percent.

We noted that the Navajo area office planned to spend special education funds for dormitory furniture, office supplies, and athletic equipment even though the Bureau's central office has not yet issued instructions which specify how special education funds should be used. Moreover, the Bureau generally ignored the House Committee on Appropriations requirement that funds be used to hire 202 special education teachers and specialists.

CONCLUSION

The Bureau is slow to comply with the mandate of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 because of poor leadership and a lack of emphasis placed on the program. The other problems, such as the late start on the student assessments, the limited efforts to hire special

education personnel, and the expenditure of funds for purposes other than hiring teachers are all a direct result of the lack of leadership and emphasis. This situation should show some improvement as the newly created division responsible for special education assumes the management of the program.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

We recommend that the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations restrict the Bureau's fiscal year 1980 special education funds to hiring special education teachers and specialists. The committees should not allow the Bureau to use these funds for other purposes without congressional approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

We recommend that the Secretary of the Interior direct the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs to:

--Determine the number of special education personnel needed by each location and develop a plan to hire those personnel at the earliest possible date.

--Develop policies, guidelines, and realistic goals to meet the mandate of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, for the delivery of special education services to all handicapped children in Bureau-operated schools.

Enclosure I describes the Bureau's special education program in the Navajo and Phoenix area offices and discusses the above issues in more detail.

Between February 23, 1979, and June 1, 1979, we contacted officials in the Bureau's Central Office, the Navajo and Phoenix area offices, seven agency offices, and 19 schools. At your request we did not take the time to obtain comments from the Department of the Interior on the matters covered in this report.

We will also send copies of this report to the Secretary of the Interior, the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, Interior's Inspector General, and other interested parties.

Sincerely yours,

Comptroller General
of the United States

Enclosure

Contents

ENCLOSURE		Page
I	THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS IS SLOW IN PROVIDING SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES TO ALL HANDICAPPED INDIAN CHILDREN	1
	Progress in providing special education has been limited	1
	Funds used for purposes other than hiring teachers	9
	Conclusion	12
	Recommendation to the Appropriations Committees	12
	Recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior	12
II	NAVAJO AREA DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS PER HANDICAPPED STUDENT	14

ENCLOSURE I

THE BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS IS SLOW IN PROVIDING SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES TO ALL HANDICAPPED INDIAN CHILDREN

The Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, Public Law 94-142, mandated that all handicapped children have available to them a free and appropriate public education which emphasizes special education and related services. Special education is specially designed instruction meeting the unique needs of a handicapped child, including classroom instruction, instruction in physical education, home instruction, and instruction within hospitals and institutions. Related services are transportation, supportive services, speech pathology and audiology, psychological services, physical and occupational therapy, recreation, early identification and assessment of disabilities in children, counseling services, and medical services for diagnostic or evaluation purposes. The law established that special education services will be provided to all children aged 3 through 18 by September 1, 1978, and children aged 3 through 21 by September 1, 1980.

PROGRESS IN PROVIDING SPECIAL EDUCATION HAS BEEN LIMITED

The Bureau has made some progress in complying with the law, but it did not meet the September 1, 1978, deadline even though the act was passed in November 1975 and allowed about 3 years for preparation and implementation. Special education programs are not yet complete because of poor leadership and a lack of emphasis given the program and because the Bureau did not implement the program at an early date. Also, the Bureau was late in evaluating students, there were not enough special education personnel, and only limited hiring and recruitment efforts were made. Consequently, many handicapped children in the Bureau's schools are not receiving the benefits of special education services. At the time of our review, area office records showed there were about 1,700 handicapped Navajo students and 800 handicapped Phoenix students for a total of 2,500 handicapped students. This number will probably increase because evaluation of students is not complete.

Navajo and Phoenix area office officials were unable to inform us or provide us with records showing the number of handicapped students receiving special education services.

ENCLOSURE I

We therefore visited 19 schools in the Navajo and Phoenix area to find out how many of the 883 handicapped students were receiving full, partial, or no special education services. Through examination of school records and discussions with teachers and other school officials, we categorized students as follows:

--If, according to teachers, all the educational requirements of a student's individual education program were being met, that student was categorized as receiving full special education services. We did not evaluate the quality of the services or whether the services were adequate to meet the handicapped needs of the student.

--If, according to teachers, one or more but not all requirements of an individual education program were being met, that student was categorized as receiving partial special education services.

--If, according to teachers, a handicapped student was not enrolled in a special education program, that student was categorized as receiving no services even though the student was attending a regular school class and could have been receiving some type of special education services.

Using these categories, teachers identified 340 students, or 38 percent, as receiving full special education services, 113 students, or 13 percent, as receiving partial services, and 430 students, or 49 percent, as receiving no services.

ENCLOSURE I

School	Handicapped students	Receiving full service	Receiving partial service	No special education service
Chinle	50	14	0	36
Cottonwood	24	24	0	0
Many Farms	19	0	0	19
Crownpoint	29	12	8	9
Wingate	63	6	17	40
Greasewood	52	8	26	18
Tohatchi	30	12	4	14
Sanostee	90	14	4	72
Teecnospos	58	38	0	20
Shiprock	36	16	0	20
Tuba City H.S	48	23	0	25
Tuba City B.S.	98	74	0	24
Leupp	80	40	0	40
Salt River	18	0	0	18
Santa Rosa Ranch	9	3	6	0
San Simon	27	14	10	3
Santa Rosa B.S	72	22	27	23
Sherman	58	20	0	38
Casa Blanca	22	0	11	11
Total	883	340	113	430

We also noted that in the Navajo area, 23 of about 70 schools with handicapped children did not have any special education teachers and that in the Phoenix area, 3 of the 25 schools with handicapped students did not have any special education teachers.

Leadership and emphasis lacking

The Bureau's initial funding of the Public Law 94-142 special education program began in fiscal year 1978 when the Congress directed that $2 million be set aside from the Bureau's general education funds for this program. An additional $1.9 million was obtained from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In fiscal year 1979, the Congress again directed that $2 million of general education funds be set aside, and also added $5 million to the Bureau of Indian Affairs' appropriation. The Bureau also received $2.4 million from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.

The Bureau established an ad hoc division responsible for special education in early 1978. However, this division did not have direct authority over area offices or

schools and was staffed with only four persons in temporary positions who had program responsibility. The Bureau officially established the division in March 1979 and increased the staff to eight positions. The central office staff has prepared some policy statements and monitored programs at some schools, a practice we encourage; however, the staff has not yet prepared or developed comprehensive guidelines for implementing and operating the program. Goals for providing full service have been established but are not very realistic. The most recent goal for the 1978-79 school year was to provide special education services to 100 percent of the handicapped Indian children, but the Navajo and Phoenix areas were providing full services to less than 40 percent of their handicapped students during the 1978-79 school year.

According to the act, the Bureau must submit an annual plan to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped to receive funding. Education officials encourage submission of annual program plans in the January to April time frame preceding the fiscal year for which the plan is approved. This is done so that funds can be provided in time to hire teachers and meet other expenses prior to the school year. However, the Bureau's annual plans were submitted late. The fiscal year 1978 plan was submitted in March 1978, 11 months late; the fiscal year 1979 plan was submitted in June 1979, 14 months late.

The special education staffs at the Navajo and Phoenix area offices have not prepared any comprehensive written guidelines or procedures. An April 1979 monitoring report on the Navajo area stated closer coordination was needed regarding budget development and distribution of funds between the area office, agencies, and schools. It also stated that a procedural plan may be needed to help the schools and agencies in meeting the requirements of the law. The April 1979 monitoring report on the Phoenix area stated more coordination between the area office agencies and schools was needed. The report stated the guidance, monitoring, and follow-through from the area office was inadequate and that an area plan providing areawide policies and procedures had not been developed. This lack of direction affected the distribution of funds and the special education program's day-to-day operations. For example:

--At 13 Navajo schools where we obtained this information, funds initially allocated to handicapped students by the Navajo agency offices for materials, supplies, and equipment were unevenly distributed. Funds for

materials and supplies ranged from $18 to $750 per handicapped student; for equipment they ranged from $0 to $292 per handicapped student. (See enc. II.)

--There was an atmosphere of confusion and uncertainty in the program's day-to-day operations. At two of the Navajo agencies we visited, the education staff complained about the lack of leadership, direction, and management of the program. One of these agency education officials stated that no written policies or directions had been received from the area office. In one case, one agency knew of instructions allowing education funds to be used for mobile housing units but another agency did not. The education staff at one agency in the Phoenix area stated that program information was sometimes confusing and conflicting. They said they were told by the Bureau's central office staff to destroy all the evaluations on students who were identified as not being handicapped. However, monitors from the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped later said that they should have retained all the evaluations for auditing purposes.

Students not evaluated on a timely basis

The act requires that in order to qualify for financial assistance an annual plan must be submitted. The plan must, among other things, assure that all children residing within a specific jurisdiction who are handicapped and are in need of special education are identified, located, and evaluated. The plan also must set forth procedures to assure that testing and evaluation materials will be selected and administered so as not to be racially or culturally discriminatory. Such materials or procedures shall be provided and administered in the child's native language or mode of communication, unless it clearly is not feasible to do so, and no single procedure shall be the sole criterion for determining an appropriate educational program for a child. The act further states the goal of providing a full educational opportunity to all handicapped children ages 3 through 18 by September 1, 1978.

The nearly 3 years the act allowed before special education services had to be provided was not necessarily a long period of time, particularly for a governmental organization that receives funds through a budget and appropriation process. It was important, therefore, that

the Bureau not waste time before identifying, locating, and evaluating Indian children. An accurate determination of the number of special education personnel, their required skills, and their needed locations cannot be made until the handicapped children have been located and evaluated. In spite of the need for immediacy, the evaluations had a slow start in the Phoenix and Navajo areas. Each area office awarded several contracts for student evaluations and started the evaluations in August 1977 in the Phoenix office and January 1978 in the Navajo office. The two area offices have evaluated 7,600 students, which we believe are most of the students needing an evaluation.

Both area offices are presently having problems with their student evaluations. An April 3, 1979, central office monitoring report on the Phoenix area stated that incorrect diagnosis and inappropriate recommendations had been made by the student evaluation contractor. A representative of the Phoenix area office also requested that 29 evaluations be returned to the contractor because inappropriate tests were conducted, the reports were incomplete, the evaluation conclusions were inconsistent with the test results, and the testing for some severely emotionally disturbed children was inadequate. Additionally, a school principal believed 23 evaluations done by one contractor contained gross errors and requested that another contractor reevaluate the students. The central office's monitoring report stated that a clarification is needed of the requirements of a proper psychological or psycho-educational assessment for a specific learning disability.

The central office monitoring report on the Navajo area office stated that some students had been misdiagnosed and/or misclassified. Some of the special education teachers and specialists at agency offices and schools also had problems with the quality of many evaluations. The following examples typify their complaints.

--The evaluations were written in such a manner as to make them confusing, difficult to interpret, and of little or no use in developing individual education programs for the students.

--The evaluations of Indian students were worthless because of culturally biased evaluation tests. School officials stated localized norms for Indian children would provide for more accurate evaluations. We were told that interpreters were not always used, although some of the students needed them.

--The evaluations were not complete; visual and hearing tests were lacking at one school.

--The evaluations were of poor quality, because health and social background histories for some students were not available or used by the testers.

Hiring efforts of special education personnel have been limited

The Navajo and Phoenix areas do not have sufficient special education personnel to provide services to all identified handicapped students. The needed personnel are special education teachers and other special education professionals, which include speech pathologists, physical therapists, social workers, diagnosticians, and technicians.

The Navajo area office had 67 percent of the special education teachers and 20 percent of the other professionals that have been identified as needed. According to the area office records, it had 39 of the 58 teachers and 5 of the 25 other professionals that were identified as needed. However, 26 of the teachers were not new hires, but were teachers converted from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act's title I program to the special education program. The title I program is directed to the special education needs of educationally deprived children. In contrast, the special education program is directed to the special education needs of handicapped children.

According to information at the Phoenix area office, they had 5 of the 27 teachers, or 19 percent, and 5 of the 32 other professionals, or 16 percent, that were identified as needed. Area office records show that 6 of the 10 special education positions are funded through the title I program and the other four positions are funded under the general education program. All 10 positions are planned for conversion to the special education program.

However, the actual number of special education personnel needed has not been completely determined, and more teachers may be required than Bureau records indicate. Both area offices are still in the process of completing student evaluations, and the number of students identified as handicapped will affect the number of teachers needed. For example, as of June 1979, one Navajo agency was still in the process of establishing positions and requesting

approvals for recruiting and hiring. This agency only had three special education teachers during the 1978-79 school year for 329 handicapped students in 14 schools and had recently identified 16 special education vacancies. These 16 vacancies were not included in the area office's statistics of needed personnel. Additionally, in the same agency, the Crownpoint Boarding School had 57 evaluations to be completed. The school principal stated he did not know how many additional teachers would be needed as a result of the evaluations.

Hiring efforts

When the Congress provided additional funds for the program, it intended that the Bureau hire an estimated 202 special education teachers and specialists. The Navajo area office received authorization to hire no more than 86 new special education personnel on December 8, 1978. However, as of June 1979, efforts to fill these positions had been insufficient. The schools that requested special education teachers did not classify the requests as urgent, and the area's education division did not request that special emphasis be directed toward filling the requests. The area's Chief of the Recruitment and Placement Section said that if priority had been assigned to these positions, a special effort to process applications and visit college students would have been made. He stated applications were sent to 200 or 300 persons on the civil service register, but few of these had been hired. He added that because no recruitment effort was made this spring, it will be difficult to hire the necessary number of teachers by the beginning of the next school year.

The Phoenix area office's hiring efforts consisted of issuing a recruitment bulletin for special education teachers on March 19, 1979, and processing 26 vacancy announcements for special education personnel as of May 31, 1979. However, only one offer of employment had resulted from these efforts. This problem was further compounded by administration and coordination problems in processing personnel positions. For example, area personnel officials stated that no one alerted them that special education positions were being established until January 1979. Also, the classification process for special education positions has been time consuming. An area personnel official stated all of the special education position descriptions had to be rewritten to conform to Public Law 95-561. Other delays resulted because agencies and schools did not determine exactly what positions they needed, and some positon requests had to be returned for changes.

Officials at both area offices stated that it is difficult to hire special education personnel because

--special education teachers are in high demand;

--the working and living conditions are poor at many of the isolated schools; and

--the career opportunities are unattractive in that appointments can not be made beyond September 30, 1980, and appointees will not be paid between the spring and fall sessions of schools.

Authority exists to establish special pay schedules or to pay post differentials for isolated areas as a recruiting incentive; however, the Bureau had not taken any specific action in this direction at the time of our review.

FUNDS USED FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN HIRING TEACHERS

Although the Bureau has made some progress in developing a special education program, the additional funds appropriated by the Congress to hire 202 special education teachers and specialists were being used for other purposes primarily because few such teachers were hired and many other teachers were being paid with funds from title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In fiscal year 1978, the Bureau received $3.9 million for the special education program. Two million dollars was set aside from the general education program and $1.9 million was Department of Health, Education and Welfare funds carried over from fiscal year 1977. A Bureau official stated most of these funds were used to evaluate Indian children. In fiscal year 1979, the Bureau's special education funds increased to $9.4 million. The Congress provided an additional $5 million and directed the Bureau to set aside $2 million from the regular education program for a total of $7 million. The Congress intended that the additional funds would make it possible for the Bureau to complete assessments and to hire an estimated 202 special education teachers and specialists. The remaining $2.4 million was obtained from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As of May 31, 1979, the Bureau had obligated $3.1 million, or 33 percent, of these fiscal year 1979 funds.

In fiscal year 1979, the Navajo and Phoenix area offices received special education allotments totaling more

than $5 million. The Navajo's allotment was $3,674,347, and Phoenix's allotment was $1,417,298. However, as of May 31, 1979, only about 16 percent of these funds had been obligated. The Navajo area had obligated $571,000; the Phoenix area had obligated $226,000. A sizeable portion of the allotments were programed for special education salaries; however, since many of the special education personnel had not been hired, and many of the present teachers were funded through title I, few of these funds were spent. For the Navajo schools we visited, only about 20 percent of the special education funds programed for salaries had been spent or obligated as of May 31, 1979.

In passing the education act for the handicapped, the Congress clearly intended that special education funds be used to help handicapped children overcome their handicaps and enjoy a full education. The act specifically allows the expenditure of funds for many services including recreation services. The expenditure of these funds are limited, however, to only the excess costs of special education and related services for handicapped children. In providing additional funds for the Bureau, the Congress was more specific; the House Committee on Appropriations report accompanying the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Bill, 1979, (Public Law 95-465) states:

> "Education.--The additional $6,013,000 recommended for school operations will provide $5,000,000 to meet the needs of handicapped children as required by Public Law 94-142 and $1,013,000 for the operation of the Labre Indian School. The Labre School will provide educational services to 366 day students in preschool through 12th grade and 65 boarding students for a total enrollment of 431.
>
> The increase for handicapped children will make it possible for the first time to serve a significant number of handicapped children. The funds will be used to complete the assessment of each child and to hire an estimated 202 special education teachers and specialists."

We noted that Navajo area school and agency officials were planning to use some of the additional appropriated funds for such things as athletic equipment and office and dormitory furniture. While these types of purchases may be allowed under the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, they were made while the specific congressional requirement to hire 202 special education teachers and specialists was generally ignored.

The following are examples of planned expenditures:

--The Tuba City Boarding School prepared requisitions for several items, such as athletic equipment, entertainment, and dormitory furniture, for a total of more than $11,000. We discussed the appropriateness of these requisitions with agency and school officials and were told the requisitions were subsequently charged to general education funds.

--Wingate Boarding School requisitioned $823 of athletic equipment, including basketballs, baseballs, footballs, softballs, softball gloves, and volleyballs. The school also requisitioned 12,000 paper cups and 96 bottles of skin lotion costing $216.

--The Shiprock agency office requisitioned 140 optical examinations and glasses at a cost of $9,800. We were told these examinations and glasses are for students not formally assessed as handicapped. The agency also requisitioned $3,200 of office equipment and $1,700 of photographic and recording equipment.

--The Shiprock Boarding School requisitioned about $2,000 of carpeting, rugs, drapery tape, and pajamas for trainable mentally handicapped students.

Navajo area office education officials informed us that any expenditure made to fulfill the requirements of its 1979-1980 school year special education program is appropriate. This program allows such things as dormitories, personal hygiene supplies, and physical education equipment. Accordingly, the Navajo area education office operates under the premise that many different types of materials and equipment are necessary to service handicapped student needs, and that special education funds may properly be spent on items, such as electric typewriters, desks, trampolines, lawn mowers, rototillers, athletic equipment, cameras, movie projectors, and calculators. Further, a Navajo education official stated that every special education classroom needs its own complement of supplies and equipment which cannot be shared with other special education or general education classes.

Agency officials in the Navajo area stated that not all schools have adequate classroom facilities and teacher housing, and three of these four agencies have programed special education funds for portable classrooms and housing. For example:

--The Western Navajo Agency has requisitioned two temporary classrooms at a cost of $48,000.

--The Eastern Navajo Agency has requested $97,000 of special education funds to purchase and install about four portable teacher housing units and two portable classrooms.

--The Shiprock Agency official stated that they need four mobile homes at two schools for teacher housing.

--The Fort Defiance Agency has programed about $177,000 for two portable classrooms and 10 portable housing units.

Three of the schools we visited in the Phoenix area also stated there were inadequate classroom facilities. However, none of these schools had programed special education funds for classroom units, instead they are trying to improve facilities with other funding.

CONCLUSION

The Bureau's slow progress in achieving the mandate of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, is a result of poor leadership and a lack of emphasis placed on the program. The other problems, such as the late start on the student assessments, the limited efforts to hire special education personnel, and the expenditure of funds for purposes other than hiring teachers are all a direct result of the lack of leadership and emphasis. This situation should show some improvement as the newly created division responsible for special education assumes the management of the program.

RECOMMENDATION TO THE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEES

We recommend that the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations restrict the Bureau's fiscal year 1980 special education funds to hiring special education teachers and specialists. The committees should not allow the Bureau to use these funds for other purposes without congressional approval.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

We recommend that the Secretary of the Interior direct the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs to:

ENCLOSURE I

--Determine the special education personnel needed, by location, and develop a plan to hire those personnel at the earliest possible date.

--Develop policies, guidelines, and realistic goals to meet the mandate of the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975, for the delivery of special education services to all handicapped children in Bureau-operated schools.

ENCLOSURE II

NAVAJO AREA

DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

PER HANDICAPPED STUDENT

School	Amount for material & supplies	Per handicapped student	Amount for equipment	Per handicapped student
Chinle Agency				
Chinle	$16,000	$ 320	$ 5,000	$100
Many Farms	10,000	526	0	0
Cottonwood	10,000	417	5,000	208
Eastern Agency				
Crownpoint	526	18	0	0
Wingate	8,738	139	5,169	82
Fort Defiance Agency				
Greasewood	37,100	713	3,700	71
Tohatchi	20,200	673	1,400	47
Shiprock Agency				
Sanostee	5,000	56	0	0
Teecnospos	5,000	86	0	0
Shiprock, Dorm #1	26,994	750	0	0
Western Agency				
Tuba City (H.S.)	30,468	635	14,000	292
Tuba City (B.S.)	11,323	116	3,000	31
Leupp	3,044	38	1,956	24